

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Ward et al. (US Patent No. 6,061,100).

Claims 4-6, 10-12, and 14-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1 and 7 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice, claims 2-4, 8-10, 13 and 17 are amended, and, thus, claims 2-6 and 8-17 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

REJECTION

Independent claims 1 and 7 are cancelled. Objected to dependent claims 4 and 10 are amended into independent form. Therefore, it is understood that claims 4-6 and 10-12 should stand as allowed.

To reject independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17, the Office Action generally relies on Ward's impulse pattern recognition and spatial motion detection, which analyze a neighboring area of a target pixel (e.g., a 5x3 window) to confirm a detected motion in a pixel (Ward, column 6, line 49 to column 8, line 5). In particular, for example, Ward, column 7, lines 16-26, discusses correcting a false motion detection by setting a motion status to either a value 0 or 1 for still or motion, respectively.

However, as also acknowledged in the Office Action, Ward fails to disclose or suggest correcting a false motion detection according to "*adding a given first value to a motion information value stored in the motion calculation buffer unit if a corresponding pixel/block has motion, and subtracting a given second value from a motion information value stored in the motion calculation buffer unit if a corresponding pixel/block has no motion*" (e.g., new independent claims 4, 10).

Further, in contrast to Ward, the claimed present invention as recited in independent claim 13 (as amended for clarity), provides:

13. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A moving image processor, comprising:

a motion detector detecting motion information values representing presence and absence of a motion for each pixel/block of an input nth image field; and

a motion calculator **adjusting according to a formulaic value** the detected motion information values of the input nth image field based upon motion information values of an input n+1th image field.

Support for the amendments to claim 16 can be found, for example, in dependent claim 16 and paragraphs 33-39 of the present Application. Independent claim 13 should be allowable for similar allowability rationale for dependent claims 4 and 10.

Further, independent claim 17 is amended for clarity, and should be allowable for similar allowability rationale for dependent claims 4 and 10. In contrast to Ward, the claimed present invention as recited in independent claim 17, provides:

17. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A machine readable storage storing at least one program controlling a moving image processor according to a process comprising:

removing spurious still regions and spurious motion regions during an image field motion detection, ***based upon a limited added to or a limited subtracted from, pixel motion information values*** of a current image field using only immediately preceding and succeeding image fields to the current image field.

The Office Action, in rejecting claims 13 and 17, relies on Ward, column 6, line 55 to column 7, line 7, however, Ward discusses “a pattern recognition circuit analyzes the neighboring area of the target pixel e.g., 5x3 window ... and detects if the matrix fits one of the six patterns shown in FIG. 3.” Ward fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention’s, “a motion calculator **adjusting according to a formulaic value** the detected motion information values of the input nth image field based upon motion information values ***of an input n+1th image field*** (e.g., claim 13) and “***removing spurious still regions and spurious motion regions*** during an image field motion detection, ***based upon a limited added to or a limited subtracted from, pixel motion information values*** of a current image field using only immediately preceding and succeeding image fields to the current image field” (e.g., claim 17).

In view of the remarks and the claim amendments, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 24, 2005

By: 
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501